

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|---------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 09/891,875 | 06/25/2001 | Harold Cote | 3795/0J514 | 9036 |
| 75 | 90 11/15/2004 | | EXAMINER | |
| DARBY & DARBY P.C. | | | NGUYEN, KIM T | |
| 805 Third Avenue New York, NY 10022 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| • | | | 3713 | 1,- |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 11/15/2004 | 15 |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

| | | .2 | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/891,875 | COTE ET AL. | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Kim Nguyen | 3713 | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communic Period for Reply | ation appears on the cover sheet v | vith the correspondence address | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FO THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this commun - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statu - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply wi Any reply received by the Office later than three months afte earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATION. 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a nication. days, a reply within the statutory minimum of th tory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MCIII, by statute, cause the application to become A | reply be timely filed rty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). | |
| Status | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b 3) Since this application is in condition for closed in accordance with the practice. | o)⊠ This action is non-final. or allowance except for formal ma | - | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | |
| 4) Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the ap 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction. | withdrawn from consideration. | | |
| Application Papers | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the | | by the Eveniner | |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a Applicant may not request that any objecti | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the state of the s | ne correction is required if the drawin | g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | |
| 12) ☑ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☑ None of: 1. ☑ Certified copies of the priority do a. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of application from the Internations * See the attached detailed Office action | ocuments have been received. ocuments have been received in the priority documents have bee al Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | Application No n received in this National Stage | |
| Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/15/01. | O-948) Paper No | Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) | |

Art Unit: 3713

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed in Canada on 12/23/98. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the 2,258,809 application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

Claim Objections

- 1. Claims 1-2, 19-20 are objected to because of the following informalities:
- a) In claim 1, line 9, the claimed limitation "input" should be corrected to "inputted".
- b) In claim 2, line 5, the claimed limitation "<u>a</u> game seed" should be corrected to "<u>the</u> game seed".
- c) In claim 19, line 6, the claimed limitation "game <u>state"</u>" should be corrected to "game <u>states</u>".
- d) In claim 20, line 4, the claimed limitation "game <u>seeds</u> that <u>correspond</u>" should be corrected to "<u>a</u> game <u>seed</u> that <u>corresponds</u>" because as stated in claim 19, lines 9-10, each game seed corresponds to only one sequence of game states.

Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 3713

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 3. Claims 11 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 11, lines 4 and 7; and claim 31, line 4, the claimed limitation "<u>the</u> computer" lacks of antecedent basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 1-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaye (US patent No. 5,709,603) in view of Schroeder et al (US patent No. 5,791,990).
- a. As per claim 1, Kaye discloses a computer gambling game comprising a computer program including a plurality of sequences of game states, each game state leads to a predetermined game outcome (col. 4, lines 14-16, 23-27, 39-41, and 45-46; and col. 10, lines 15-45); an initiator code (col. 6, lines 66-67; and col. 7, lines 1-8); the computer program being provided an initiator code, executes a sequence of game state and provides the game outcome

Art Unit: 3713

(col. 10, lines 15-53). Kaye does not explicitly disclose a look up table including game seeds and does not disclose retrieving a game seed from the look up table. However, Schroeder suggests including a look up table containing game seeds and retrieving the game seeds (col. 6, lines 66-67; and col. 7, lines 1-8). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the look up table of Schroeder to the computer gambling game of Kaye in order to facilitate generating a random number to a game of chance.

- b. As per claim 2-3, indexing game seed in a database for facilitating retrieving a game seed would have been well known to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. Further, relating an initiator code with the index in order to retrieve a correct seed corresponding with the program code would have been obvious design choice.
- c. As per claim 4, Schroeder discloses using an initiator code 230 (Fig. 5B) in the form of symbols (col. 6, lines 65-66).
- d. As per claim 5, Schroeder discloses an instant lottery ticket (col. 4, lines 50-51).
- e. As per claim 6, Schroeder discloses a control number to validate the outcome (Fig. 4A; col. 7, lines 8-29).
- f. As per claim 7-9, Kaye discloses verifying an entry (col. 7, lines 21-25). Further, including data for verifying purpose in a look up table, encrypting or decrypting data in a database according to an encryption key would have been well known to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.
- g. As per claim 10-11, refer to discussion in claims 1-2 above.

Art Unit: 3713

- h. As per claim 12-15, Kaye discloses writing a program on a CD-ROM (col. 7, lines 2-5). Further, as to claims 14-15, downloading a program or an initiator code from a computer network would have been well known.
- i. As per claim 16-18, Kaye discloses an adventure game (col. 8, lines 2-20). Further, implementing a casino game or a gambling game on a computer game would have been well known to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.
- j. As per claim 19-20, refer to discussion in claim 1 above.
- k. As per claim 21, shuffling game seeds before storing the game seeds in a memory device would have been well known.
- 1. As per claim 22-24, refer to discussion in claims 7 and 10-11 above.
- m. As per claim 25, Kaye discloses storing the initiator code (col. 3, lines 20-21). Further, storing data in a computer readable database would have been well known to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.
- n. As per claim 26-32 and 34, refer to discussion in claims 1-6, 8, 11, and 15 above. Further, representing a code in binary format, downloading a code before inputting the code to a computer both well known and obvious design choice.
- o. As per claim 33, Kaye discloses storing game outcomes in a look up table (col. 4, lines 33-35).

Art Unit: 3713

Page 6

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kim Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 308-7915. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:3OAM to 5:OOPM ET.

The central official fax number is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

kn

Date: November 9, 2004

KIM NGUYEN DIMARY EYAMINE